

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please add additional Figures 8A and 8B to the application.

## Applicant Remarks

### 1. The drawings

- a. Two figures, 8A and 8B, are added to show a cross section of the counter bore feature described in claim 13 in response to the Office requirement to show the counter bore feature in the drawings.

### 2. The specification

- a. A description of Figures 8A and 8B has been added to the specification.
- b. There is one minor grammatical correction in paragraph [0023].
- c. The original abstract was objected to because the abstract was written as two paragraphs. The abstract has been rewritten in the form of one paragraph along with one minor grammatical correction.

### 3. The claims

- a. Claim 1 has been amended to include a distinguishing feature where the relative distances between measuring points on the two frames are made by a length measuring device. This feature provides additional distinction of applicant's invention from Office cited art.

Applicant also traverses the U.S.C. §102e rejection of claim 1 being anticipated by U.S. 6,763,597 to Lysen. Applicant's invention is fundamentally based on measuring the relative distances between two frames at specified points. In contrast, Lysen does not directly measure the relative distance between the two measuring means (i.e. frames). Instead, the two dimensional positions of the light beams on three optoelectronic sensors are measured. The relative positions of the light beams within the optoelectronic sensors in the x and y directions are interpreted as an angular orientation or skew orientation without directly measuring the distance between the measuring means in any way. In U.S. 6,763,597 to Lysen, claim 11, the distance between the measuring means is determined by measuring the angular divergence of the second and third light sources. Lysen does not teach or claim any method of directly measuring the relative distances between the two measuring means. Therefore, applicant

submits that currently amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and requests allowance.

- b. Claims 2 through 5 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to their reintroduction in this application or a further continuation or divisional application.
- c. Claim 6 has been canceled and replaced by new independent claim 14. Claim 14 is a rewriting of original claim 6 to incorporate all the features of original claim 1 and original claim 6. Therefore applicant submits that claim 14 is currently in allowable form and requests allowance.
- d. Claim 7 has been amended to reflect currently amended claim 1. Applicant submits that the traverse and amendment to prior base claim 1 is sufficient to overcome the Office objection to claim 7 and requests allowance.
- e. Applicant submits that the traverse and amendment to prior base claim 1 is sufficient to overcome the U.S.C. §102e rejection of claim 8 and requests allowance.
- f. Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate a distinguishing feature where the geometric shapes are solid as opposed to U.S. 6,763,597 Figure 1 where geometric shapes could possibly be interpreted as encompassing lasers being round and detectors being square. Applicant requests withdrawal of the U.S.C. §102e rejection to claim 9 and requests allowance.
- g. Applicant submits that the traverse and amendment to prior base claim 1 is sufficient to overcome the Office objection to claims 10-13 and requests allowance of these claims.

Applicant believes that all matters in the Office action mailed on March 9, 2005 have been addressed and requests entry of the modifications and amendments. For all of the reasons given above, applicant respectfully submits that the errors in the specification are corrected, the claims comply with Section 112, the claims define the invention over the cited art under Section 102, and the claims are of patentable merit. Accordingly, applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully requests.

It is also further submitted that patentable subject matter is clearly present. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

If, after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the applicant, by telephone, to discuss such issues or schedule an interview to address such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mark V. Loen", followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Mark V. Loen

Applicant